

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 198

SP 022 037

AUTHOR Quisenberry, Nancy L.; And Others
TITLE Dean's Grant: Third Year Report and Final Evaluation. Volume II.
INSTITUTION Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 82
CONTRACT 790-1158
NOTE 51p.; Dean's Grant Project.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Educational Legislation; Formative Evaluation; Higher Education; Information Dissemination; *Mainstreaming; *Material Development; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Special Education
IDENTIFIERS *Deans Grant Project; *Southern Illinois University Carbondale

ABSTRACT

The 3-year Dean's Grant Project at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale was designed to: (1) create a set of materials and resources, relating to serving the handicapped, to be used in the training of teachers; (2) provide training for faculty on Public Law 94-142 and the implications of the law for training teachers and administrators; (3) develop and disseminate materials, relating to serving the handicapped, for use by students and faculty in the program; (4) involve in the change process personnel directly responsible for the program; and (5) integrate materials and activities developed by the project into existing courses and programs. The first year of the project was devoted to developing and disseminating materials to and planning activities for students in required education courses. The second year focused on the impact of the materials and activities on the supervisors of practicum student experiences, methods course instructors, and students. The objective of the final year was to familiarize administrators and other educational leaders with the needs, characteristics, and methods of instructing handicapped students. An evaluation is presented of the progress made in each of these 3 years. Appendixes include criterion-referenced tests used in the project, and a form for analyzing the experience of professional education centers with the handicapped. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED228198

DEAN'S GRANT: THIRD YEAR REPORT AND FINAL EVALUATION

VOLUME II

Dean's Grant Project
College of Education
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois



1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy L. Quisenberry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

DEAN'S GRANT: THIRD YEAR REPORT
AND FINAL EVALUATION

Volume II

Office of Special Education - Contract 790 1158

Donald L. Beggs, Dean

Nancy L. Quisenberry, Associate Dean for
Undergraduate Studies and Project Director

Sidney R. Miller, Special Education Trainer

Michael White, Graduate Assistant

College of Education
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Carbondale, IL 62901

1982

Table of Contents

	Page
The Development of the Dean's Grant Project	2
The Plan for Integrating Special Education Concepts Into the Teacher Education Program	2
Formative Evaluation and the Dean's Grant Project	3
The Formative Evaluation Process	4
First Year	5
Materials	5
Evaluation	6
Faculty Survey	6
Student Survey	8
Criterion Reference Test Pre-Post Results	8
Knowledge	8
Attitude	11
Second Year	12
Materials	12
Activities	13
Evaluation	14
Site Visits	14
Disability Awareness Workshops	14
Material	14
Third Year	14
Materials	15
Activities	15
Evaluation	15
Materials	15
Site Visit	16
Determining the Effectiveness of the Infusion Effort on the Teacher Education Program	16
Summary	23
References	28
Appendices	30
A Criterion Referenced Tests	31
B Analysis of Professional Education Centers- Experiences with Handicapped	39

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Results of Faculty Survey of Dean's Grant Materials	7
2	Results of Student Survey on Dean's Grant Materials	9
3	Characteristics of Handicapped Students	10
4	The Role of the Regular Educator - EDUC 302	10
5	P.L. 94-142 Origins and Foundations - EDUC 303	11
6	Summary of Responses to the <u>Quisenberry/Miller Questionnaire:</u> <u>Assessment of Knowledge on Education of the Handicapped by</u> <u>Incoming Teacher Education Students by Frequency and</u> <u>Percentage</u>	17
7	Summary of Responses to the <u>Quisenberry/Miller Questionnaire:</u> <u>Assessment of Knowledge on Education of the Handicapped by</u> <u>Student Teachers by Frequency and Percentage</u>	20

List of Charts

Chart

Page

- | | | |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | Pert Chart of Activities for Southern Illinois
University-Carbondale Dean's Grant | 24 |
|---|--|----|

Dean's Grant: Third Year Report
and Final Evaluation

The Development of the Dean's Grant Project

In order to instill an awareness of the intent of P.L. 94-142 and provide students and faculty with a better understanding of Individual Educational Programs and mainstreaming, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale incorporated materials and activities relating to serving the handicapped into its Teacher Education Program. The project was the result of a Dean's Grant from the Office of Special Education, Department of Education. Dr. Nancy Quisenberry, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, College of Education, served as Project Director, and Dr. Sidney Miller, Special Education Trainer, assisted in the development of materials and activities. A coordination council made up of deans from the colleges having teacher education programs, the College of Education's Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the department chairpersons, the coordinators of Professional Education Experiences and the Special Education Trainer advised the Dean of the College's development and implementation of the grant.

The Plan for Integrating Special Education Concepts Into the Teacher Education Program

The goals for the three years of the Dean's Grant Project at SIU-C were as follows:

1. To create a set of materials and resources relating to serving the handicapped which could be used by faculty members involved in the training of teachers.
2. To provide training for university personnel on P.L. 94-142 and the implications of the law for training teachers and administrators.

3. To develop materials relating to serving the handicapped for use by students and faculty in the Teacher Education Program and to provide for the dissemination of these materials.
4. To involve in the change process those university personnel most directly responsible for the Teacher Education Program.
5. To integrate materials and activities developed by the project personnel into the College of Education's existing courses and programs for teacher preparation.

Formative Evaluation and the Dean's Grant Project

In recent years, changes in teacher education programs have resulted from pressure by legislative bodies and single issue advocate groups who have championed such causes as the handicapped and/or the multi-cultural student. Institutions depending on their social-political-cultural composition have attempted to address these issues through a variety of strategies, such as the development of new course(s) and/or the integration of the issue's theme into existing courses.

Regardless of the reason for change or the form such change takes, the procedure for evaluating the change is often either unaddressed or reflects informal or formal questioning of faculty and students. Generally these procedures yield inconclusive data. Existing mechanisms, offering valid and reliable means of evaluating change, have been largely ignored.

In order to avoid this pitfall, the project staff adopted a formative assessment approach as the critical component in evaluating the project.

It was thought that a formative evaluation process would facilitate the involvement of the faculty, aid in the development of products, and best determine their efficacy. Too often those responsible for educational change assume that the evaluation process has only one purpose: To determine the end result of change. However, it is important to realize that evaluation may be used to develop, refine and monitor change in education programs. This distinction has received relatively little attention in the field of education.

The Formative Evaluation Process

The evaluation process occurred at the following levels:

1. A nineteen item pre-post criterion referenced test was administered to students in the education program in order to assess their prior level of knowledge and attitude concerning the handicapped and to determine the impact of the materials and related class lectures.
2. Upon completion of the workshops and site-visits, the faculty and students were asked to evaluate these activities via a survey with regards to their relevance, usefulness, and format.
3. Prior to the dissemination of materials to students, the faculty responsible for those courses evaluated the materials in terms of their relevance, usefulness, and format.

4. After having made the revisions suggested by the faculty, the materials were disseminated to the students where they were again evaluated with regards to their usefulness, relevance and format.

The criterion acceptance level established for inclusion of material in a course program was that at least 80 percent of the faculty and students must find the information useful, relevant and presented in an understandable manner.

Through a formative evaluative approach, the project staff obtained valuable input from the faculty and students in the target courses. It is the staff's impression that faculty members were more interested in integrating materials in classes that they had helped to design. Their involvement also made them better able to modify the materials as the need arose.

First Year

The first year of the project (1979-80) was devoted to the development and dissemination of materials and activities to students in the following curriculum areas: 1) the general technique and procedure course, 2) the general educational psychology course, and 3) the history/philosophy of education course. These courses were selected because they are required for all the undergraduate students in the College of Education.

Materials

The materials designed for inclusion in the general technique and procedure course contained information on the role of the regular educator in the education of the handicapped, an annotated bibliography,

a listing of national agencies and a listing of diagnostic tools. The materials designed for inclusion in the general educational psychology course contained information regarding the characteristics of handicapped students and a glossary of terms. The materials designed for students in the history/philosophy of education course contained information on the history of special education and a summary of related litigation and legislation. (Note: These sets of materials are available from the University's Bookstore.)

Evaluation

The criterion level established for the eventual integration of any material into the existing curricula for the following year was that 80 percent of the faculty and students judge the material to be relevant, useful and presented in an understandable format.

Faculty Survey

The instructors of the general educational psychology course agreed that the materials in their package were presented in an understandable manner and would be relevant and useful to them and their students.

The instructors of the general technique and procedure course indicated that, while the entire package they received was understandable and useful, only the Role of the Regular Educator in the Education of the Handicapped and the Selected Annotated Bibliography was pertinent to their class.

The instructors of the history/philosophy of education course favorably evaluated their informational packages, but indicated a preference to present the information via computerized instruction. (See Table 1)

Table 1

Results of Faculty Survey of Dean's Grant Materials

Questions	P.L. 94-142 Origins and Foundations		Special Education Materials		Classroom Instruc- tion and Behavior Management		Diagnostic Tests	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do you feel this in- formation is rele- vant to:								
a) you?	6	0	10	0	22	6	2	2
b) your students?	6	0	10	0	NA*	NA*	1	3
Do you feel this in- formation to be use- ful to:								
a) you?	6	0	9	1	22	6	1	3
b) your students?	6	0	10	0	NA*	NA*	0	4
Is this information presented in an under- standable manner?								
	6	0	10	0	28	0	4	0

NA - Not Applicable

Student Survey.

The results of the student survey were very positive, with over 95 percent of the students surveyed responding favorably to questions regarding the relevancy, usefulness, and format of the informational packages. (See Table 2)

Criterion Reference Test Pre-Post Results

Three criterion reference tests were developed to assess the impact of the materials disseminated to the students (Appendix A). These tests were designed to establish whether the students had achieved a more complete understanding of the issues concerning the education of the handicapped. The pre-post tests included questions designed to assess whether the student's attitudes toward the education of the handicapped had changed as a result of reading the material developed by the Dean's Grant personnel and experiencing classroom lectures which parallel the materials.

Knowledge. Students enrolled in the general educational psychology course (N=227) were pre-tested on an eight item criterion referenced test which was developed to ascertain the students' current level of knowledge concerning the characteristics of handicapped students. Following the pre-test, the students were provided the informational package which was developed for their class and received classroom lectures concerning special education. The mean of the pre-test was 4.64 with a standard deviation of 1.38. The mean of the post-test was 5.48 with a standard deviation of 1.27. This data was analyzed via a one-way analysis of variance. The results indicated that students' knowledge significantly increased ($p < .01$) during the semester. (See Table 3)

Table 2

Results of Student Survey on Dean's Grant Materials

Questions	P.L. 94-142 Origins and Foundations		Characteristics of Handicapped Students		The Role of the Reg- ular Educator in the Education of Handi- capped		Glossary	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do you feel this information is rele- vant to you?	100	6	215	5	240	7	226	5
Do you feel this information will be useful to you?	190	6	215	5	240	7	215	5
Do you feel this information is presented in an understandable manner?	196	0	290	0	247	0	220	0

Students enrolled in the general technique and procedure course (N=253) were pretested on an eight item criterion referenced test which was designed to assess their current level of knowledge concerning the role of the regular educator in the education of the handicapped. Prior to the administration of the post-test, the students were provided their informational package and attended lectures concerning this issue. The mean of the pretest was 4.7 with a standard deviation of 1.5. The mean of the post-test was 5.5 with a standard deviation of 1.8. An

Table 3
 Characteristics of Handicapped Students
 EDUC 301

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F
Model	30.79	1	30.79	16.52*
Error	421.26	226	1.86	
Corrected Total	452.05	227		

* $p < .01$

An analysis of variance indicated a significant increase in knowledge ($p < .01$) during the semester. (See Table 4)

Students enrolled in the history/philosophy of education course (N=201) were pretested on a criterion referenced test which was developed to assess their level of knowledge concerning the history of special education and the legislative precedents leading to the passage of P.L. 94-142. Prior to the administration of the post-test, the students were provided their educational package and participated in classroom

Table 4
 The Role of the Regular Educator
 EDUC 302

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F
Model	33.37	1	33.37	21.17*
Error	468.56	252	1.85	
Corrected Total	507.94	253		

* $p < .01$

lectures concerning these issues. The mean for the pre-test was 3.06 with a standard deviation of 1.28. The mean for the post-test was 3.84 with a standard deviation of 1.37. An analysis of variance indicated a significant increase in knowledge ($p < .01$) during the semester. (See Table 5)

Table 5

P.L. 94-142 Origins and Foundations
EDUC 303

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F
Model	30.11	1	30.11	16.83*
Error	357.98	200	1.79	
Corrected Total	388.09	201		

* $p < .01$

Attitude. All students were pre-post tested concerning their attitudes towards the education of the handicapped in the least restrictive environment.

Pre-test scores of the students enrolled in the general educational psychology course indicated that only 45 percent originally felt that handicapped students could receive a better education in the regular classroom. Post-test scores indicated an increase from 45 percent to 75 percent during the course of the semester. On the pre-test, 50 percent of the students believed that regular teachers should be trained to work with handicapped students. Post-test scores demonstrated an increase from 50 percent to 95 percent in regard to such training.

Students enrolled in the general technique and procedure course were pre-post tested on their attitudes regarding their role in the education of the handicapped. Although the pre-post test results showed very little increase, this can be attributed to the very positive attitudes these students professed on the pre-test.

Students enrolled in the history/philosophy of education course also demonstrated an attitudinal change from pre to post-test. Approximately 20 percent of these students indicated on the pre-test that education of the handicapped is unnecessary and should be conducted in institutions. The post-test results indicated a change with 90 percent of the students perceiving that education of the handicapped is appropriate and best accomplished in the regular classroom.

Second Year

During the second year of the project (1980-81), center coordinators (supervisors of practicum student experiences), method course instructors, and all of the students in these experiences were impacted.

Materials

A questionnaire which was designed to obtain information regarding the number of handicapped students mainstreamed in each center coordinator's region was developed (Appendix B). It was felt that this information would facilitate the assignment of appropriate practicum sites. (Clark, Miller, Quisenberry, 1981) The questionnaire was completed by 12 center coordinators responsible for the placement of practicum/intern students in 79 schools and/or districts. The information was analyzed via analysis of variance to determine if there were differences between

regions (Southern, Northern, Central, Urban, Rural and Suburban) in terms of the percentage of handicapped students served. The results indicated that a greater percentage of handicapped students were being served in the suburban regions as compared to the rural regions.

The educational materials developed for the center coordinators and their students contained information on the various instructional materials that have been developed for special populations. The materials designed for the method course instructors and their students contained information on teaching and management strategies that have been used successfully with handicapped students, and a list of diagnostic tests used by special educators to assess handicapped children and youth.

Activities

The project staff provided site visits to various mainstreaming programs for the center coordinators and the method course instructors. The following districts were visited:

1. Special School District of St. Louis County,
St. Louis, Missouri
2. Carbondale Community High School District 165,
Carbondale, Illinois
3. Wabash and Ohio Valley Special Education District,
Norris City, Illinois
4. Springfield Public School District, Springfield,
Illinois
5. Carrie Bussey School, Champaign, Illinois

The project staff and personnel from Southern Illinois University Specialized Student Services also conducted disability awareness

workshops for the faculty. Four handicapped individuals participated in these workshops which were designed to address the realities of mainstreaming.

Evaluation

Site Visits. A total of fifteen faculty participated in the five site visits. Their feedback was positive, with three faculty submitting descriptions of their experiences for publication in the Dean's Grant Newsletter.

Disability Awareness Workshops. At the conclusion of the workshop the faculty (N=15) indicated that the experiences aided them in understanding the problems that handicapped students experience in public schools and that this understanding would help them better prepare prospective teachers to integrate handicapped students into their classrooms.

Material. Feedback regarding the material was positive. The center coordinators indicated that the material designed for them was useful, relevant and presented in an understandable format. (Clark, et.al., 1981) The evaluation of the material disseminated to the method course instructors was also positive, with 85 percent of the respondents indicating that they plan on disseminating the material to their students.

Third Year

The third and final year of the Dean's Grant Project (1981-82) focused on personnel in the areas of educational administration, educational leadership, and other individuals involved in the process of educational administrative certification. The objective was to familiarize them with the needs, characteristics and methods of instructing handicapped students.

Materials

The material designed for the department administrators and pre-service administrators was intended to familiarize them with six task areas the project staff considered central to the administrator's role in the implementation of P.L. 94-142. The six task areas are:

1. School Finance
2. Curriculum and Instruction
3. Pupil Personnel Service
4. Staff Recruitment, Employment and Training
5. School/Community Relations
6. Physical Facilities

A list of suggested readings, covering areas such as administration and responsibilities, Barrier Free Access, and Parent's Rights was also disseminated to the faculty. (Beggs, et.al., 1982)

Activities

In order to become more familiar with an operational special education program the educational administration faculty and members of the educational certification committee visited the St. Louis Special Education School District. They met with the district's superintendent as well as other central office personnel, and observed a number of special education programs designed to promote appropriate education in the least restrictive environment. In addition, they met with district administrators who discussed legal, financial, and personnel issues relevant to the conduct of Public Law 94-142.

Evaluation

Materials. There was 95 percent (N=20) agreement among the faculty that the materials they received were useful, relevant, and understandable.

They further asked that the materials be duplicated so that they could be used with students in selected general administrative courses.

Site Visit. All of the faculty who visited the St. Louis Special Education School District reported finding the trip beneficial in terms of increasing their understanding of special populations, the related services, and understanding the legal and financial aspects of P.L. 94-142.

Determining the Effectiveness of the Infusion Effort on the Teacher Education Program

In order to determine the efficacy of the Teacher Education Program at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale a questionnaire was developed and administered to all incoming students who indicated that they were majoring in the field of education (N=524) and all students who had recently completed all of their course work and were currently in the internship phase of their program (N=297). The questionnaire was composed of 19 multiple choice questions ranging from those concerned with the law to questions on the role of the regular educator in teaching the handicapped youth.

The results of the responses by the incoming teacher education students are shown in Table 6.

As can be seen from the results those students having completed their course work were better able to answer all of the 19 questions. For example, question number 14, which deals with the regular teacher's role in the education of the handicapped student, was answered correctly by 87 percent of the student teachers as opposed to 20 percent of those students entering the program.

Table 6

Summary of Responses to the Quisenberry/Miller Questionnaire:
Assessment of Knowledge on Education of the Handicapped by Incoming
Teacher Education Students by Frequency and Percentage

Questionnaire Item	Response	
	Freq.	Percent
1. Identification of students with learning problems/handicaps should begin with:		
**a) the regular classroom teacher.	322	61.4
b) special educators.	150	28.6
c) psychologists.	23	4.4
d) social workers.	13	2.5
UR*	16	3.1
2. Regular educators.		
**a) should be trained to mainstream handicapped students.	183	34.9
b) are not expected to teach handicapped students.	21	4.0
c) should learn about handicapped students on a volunteer basis.	107	20.4
d) need extra training to work with the handicapped.	202	38.6
UR	11	2.1
3. Circle the person or persons who you feel should be involved in the development of a handicapped student's I.E.P.		
a) Parents	16	3.1
b) Regular classroom teacher	4	0.8
c) Special educators	28	5.3
d) Student	7	1.3
**e) All of the above	427	81.5
UR	42	8.0
4. Preparing handicapped students for job awareness and job training will be.		
a) a benefit to the handicapped.	77	14.7
**b) a benefit to the handicapped and the community.	430	82.1
c) misuse of tax dollars.	3	0.6
d) a waste of time.	7	1.3
UR	7	1.3
5. The problems of the handicapped		
a) too difficult for regular educators to mediate in the regular classroom.	41	7.8
b) can only be mediated by special educators.	30	5.7
**c) can be mediated cooperatively by special and regular educators.	439	83.8
d) a burden on the schools.	4	0.8
UR	10	1.9
6. Of the behaviors listed below, which one <u>best</u> describes a student who has a visual perception problem?		
a) Has difficulty seeing objects that are far away	117	22.3
b) Rubbing his eyes frequently	54	10.3
**c) Inability to discriminate between different symbols	329	62.8
d) Inability to communicate with sign language	10	1.9
UR	14	2.7
7. Which of the following is an underlying deficit exhibited by a student who is having an <u>auditory perception</u> problem?		
**a) Inability to discriminate sounds	284	54.2
b) Watching lips of someone communicating with him	89	17.0
c) Uses sign language	13	2.5
d) Inability to hear a stimulus	118	22.5
UR	20	3.8

*UR = Unusable Responses

**Correct Response

	Response	
	Freq.	Percent
8. If a student is experiencing difficulties in academic or social interactions, and is suspected of being educationally handicapped, the first thing the classroom teacher is required to do is:		
a) send a letter to the parents of the student.	233	44.4
b) implement an individualized education program.	49	9.4
**c) make a referral.	145	27.7
d) develop a special program for the student.	72	13.7
UR	25	4.7
9. Which are the major sensory areas that are important to the educational growth of a student?		
a) Speech	2	0.4
b) Vision	4	0.8
c) Hearing	5	0.9
**d) b and c	33	6.3
e) all of the above	467	89.1
UR	13	2.5
10. Which of the persons below have been delegated the responsibility for referring a student for a case study evaluation?		
a) Regular classroom teacher	75	14.3
b) Parents	25	4.7
c) Special education teacher	34	6.5
**d) Any one of the above	359	68.5
UR	31	6.0
11. The primary role of the multidisciplinary team is to:		
a) do preschool screening.	23	4.4
b) assess the handicapped student's level of functioning.	65	12.4
c) refer handicapped students for a case study evaluation.	33	6.3
**d) a and b	89	17.0
e) all of the above	268	51.1
UR	46	8.8
12. The following are mandated components of the Individualized Education Program exception		
a) the student's level of performance.	73	13.9
**b) due process hearing.	187	35.7
c) short-term objectives.	56	10.7
d) special education and related services	53	10.1
e) annual goals.	88	16.8
UR	67	12.8
13. An Individual Education Program is:		
a) a legally binding document.	19	3.6
**b) only for handicapped students.	65	12.4
c) for all children in our schools.	190	36.3
d) b and c	101	19.3
e) all of the above	99	18.9
UR	50	9.5
14. Regular classroom teachers are responsible for participating in the education of the handicapped due to the Congressional legislation of:		
a) the Hatch Act.	47	9.0
b) the 1964 Civil Rights Act.	83	15.8
**c) the Adjournment Resolution of 1975.	106	20.2
d) P.L. 94-142	157	30.0
UR	131	25.0

*UR = Unusable Responses

**Correct Response

	Response	
	Freq.	Percent
15. According to Deno's cascade which of the following is the least restrictive environment possible for handicapped students?		
a) Special education classroom	69	13.2
**b) Regular classroom	78	14.9
c) Special school	46	8.8
d) Regular classroom with supportive services, e.g. resource room	184	35.1
e) Institutions	28	5.3
UR	119	22.7
16. Segregation of handicapped individuals was supported by the following philosopher(s).		
*a) Plato	32	6.1
b) John Locke	76	14.5
c) Jean Jacques Rousseau	59	11.3
d) None of the above	214	40.8
UR	143	27.3
17. Which of the following individual(s) are considered to be pioneers in the education of the handicapped?		
a) Jean-Marc Gaspard Itard	58	11.1
b) Edward Sequin	40	7.6
c) Maria Montessori	70	13.3
*d) All of the above	198	37.8
UR	158	30.2
18. The constitutional amendment that requires states to provide equal protection of the law to all its citizens is:		
a) 5th amendment	86	16.4
*b) 14th amendment	180	34.4
c) 6th amendment	51	9.7
d) 4th amendment	65	12.4
UR	142	27.1
19. The Supreme Court decision that assured that those states providing educational services to any citizens must be provided to all is		
a) Doe vs. Board of School Directors of the city of Milwaukee	28	5.3
b) Spangler vs. Board of Education	86	16.4
*c) Brown et. al. vs. Board of Education of Topeka et. al.	189	36.1
d) Beattie vs. State Board of Education	66	12.6
UR	155	29.6

*UR = Unusable Responses
 **Correct Response

Table 7

Summary of Responses to the Quisenberry/Miller Questionnaire:
Assessment of Knowledge on Education of the Handicapped by
 Student Teachers by Frequency and Percentage

Questionnaire Item	Response	
	Freq.	Percent
1. Identification of students with learning problems/handicaps should begin with:		
a) the regular classroom teacher.	235	79.1
b) special educators.	39	13.1
c) psychologists.	8	2.7
d) social workers.	7	2.4
UR*	7	2.4
2. Regular educators:		
a) should be trained to mainstream handicapped students.	140	47.1
b) are not expected to teach handicapped students.	6	2.0
c) should learn about handicapped students on a volunteer basis.	22	7.4
d) need extra training to work with the handicapped.	117	39.4
UR	6	2.0
3. Circle the person or persons who you feel should be involved in the development of a handicapped student's I.E.P.		
a) Parents	8	2.7
b) Regular classroom teacher	9	3.0
c) Special educators	16	5.4
d) Student	5	1.7
e) All of the above	242	81.5
UR	17	5.7
4. Preparing handicapped students for job awareness and job training will be.		
a) a benefit to the handicapped.	28	9.4
b) a benefit to the handicapped and the community.	253	85.2
c) misuse of tax dollars.	5	1.7
d) a waste of time.	2	0.7
UR	6	2.0
5. The problems of the handicapped		
a) too difficult for regular educators to mediate in the regular classroom.	15	5.1
b) can only be mediated by special educators.	6	2.0
c) can be mediated cooperatively by special and regular educators.	266	89.6
d) a burden on the schools.	2	0.7
UR	7	2.4
6. Of the behaviors listed below, which one <u>best</u> describes a student who has a visual perception problem?		
a) Has difficulty seeing objects that are far away	40	13.5
b) Rubbing his eyes frequently	27	9.1
c) Inability to discriminate between different symbols	214	72.1
d) Inability to communicate with sign language	3	1.0
UR	13	4.4
7. Which of the following is an underlying deficit exhibited by a student who is having an <u>auditory perception</u> problem?		
a) Inability to discriminate sounds	194	65.3
b) Watching lips of someone communicating with him	31	10.4
c) Uses sign language	10	3.4
d) Inability to hear a stimulus	46	15.5
UR	16	5.4

UR = Unusable Responses

**Correct Response

	Response	
	Freq.	Percent
8. If a student is experiencing difficulties in academic or social interactions, and is suspected of being educationally handicapped, the first thing the classroom teacher is required to do is:		
a) send a letter to the parents of the student.	75	25.3
b) implement an individualized education program.	14	4.7
**c) make a referral.	167	56.2
d) develop a special program for the student.	19	6.4
UR	17	5.7
9. Which are the major sensory areas that are important to the educational growth of a student?		
a) Speech	0	0.0
b) Vision	2	0.7
c) Hearing	10	3.4
**d) b and c	31	10.4
e) all of the above	245	82.5
UR	9	3.0
10. Which of the persons below have been delegated the responsibility for referring a student for a case study evaluation?		
a) Regular classroom teacher	42	14.1
b) Parents	6	2.0
c) Special education teacher	20	6.7
**d) Any one of the above	210	70.7
UR	15	5.1
11. The primary role of the multidisciplinary team is to:		
a) do preschool screening.	8	2.7
b) assess the handicapped student's level of functioning.	54	18.2
c) refer handicapped students for a case study evaluation.	9	3.0
**d) a and b	46	15.5
e) all of the above	163	54.9
UR	17	5.7
12. The following are mandated components of the Individualized Education Program exception:		
a) the student's level of performance.	31	10.4
**b) due process hearing.	139	46.9
c) short-term objectives.	30	10.1
d) special education and related services	36	12.1
e) annual goals.	30	10.1
UR	31	10.4
13. An Individual Education Program is:		
a) a legally binding document.	39	13.1
**b) only for handicapped students.	90	30.3
c) for all children in our schools.	48	16.2
d) b and c	52	17.5
e) all of the above	52	17.5
UR	16	5.4
14. Regular classroom teachers are responsible for participating in the education of the handicapped due to the Congressional legislation of:		
a) the Hatch Act.	4	1.3
b) the 1964 Civil Rights Act.	13	4.4
**c) the Adjournment Resolution of 1975.	8	2.7
d) P.L. 94-142	259	87.2
UR	11	3.7

UR = Unusable Responses

**Correct Response

	Response	
	Freq.	Percent
15. According to Deno's cascade which of the following is the least restrictive environment possible for handicapped students?		
a) Special education classroom	20	6.7
**b) Regular classroom	69	23.2
c) Special school	17	5.7
d) Regular classroom with supportive services, e.g. resource room	169	57.0
e) Institutions	3	1.0
UR	19	6.4
16. Segregation of handicapped individuals was supported by the following philosopher(s).		
**a) Plato	22	7.4
b) John Locke	65	21.9
c) Jean Jacque Rosseau	47	15.9
d) None of the above	132	44.4
UR	31	10.4
17. Which of the following individual(s) are considered to be pioneers in the education of the handicapped?		
a) Jean-Marc Gaspard Itard	34	11.4
b) Edward Sequin	22	7.4
c) Maria Montessori	71	24.0
**d) All of the above	129	43.4
UR	39	13.1
18. The constitutional amendment that requires states to provide equal protection of the law to all its citizens is:		
a) 5th amendment	62	20.9
**b) 14th amendment	142	47.9
c) 6th amendment	34	11.4
d) 4th amendment	27	9.1
UR	32	10.8
19. The Supreme Court decision that assured that those states providing educational services to any citizens must be provided to all is		
a) Doe vs. Board of School Directors of the city of Milwaukee	18	6.1
b) Spangler vs. Board of Education	25	8.4
**c) Brown et. al. vs. Board of Education of Topeka et. al.	203	68.4
d) Beattie vs. State Board of Education	20	6.7
UR	30	10.1

*UR = Unusable Responses
 **Correct Response

Summary

Evaluation of the Dean's Grant Project, indicates that the target audience has been positively effected and the goals, conceived nearly four years ago, have been met.

The project has accomplished the following:

1. Fully infused preparation for teaching the handicapped in mainstreamed settings in all undergraduate teacher education majors.
2. Established field experience with handicapped children and youth for all pre-service teachers.
3. Planned for the integration of teaching the handicapped in all undergraduate method courses.
4. Incorporated into all levels of the administrative certification program, administrative preparation for P.L. 94-142.

A Pert Chart summarizing activities for the three years follows.

Chart 1

PERT CHART OF ACTIVITIES FOR
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY-CARBONDALE DEAN'S GRANT

	<u>First Year (1979-80)</u>												<u>Second Year (1980-81)</u>												<u>Third Year (1981-82)</u>												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	
I. Preliminary Preparation																																					
A. Develop bibliographies.	*	*	*										*	*												*	*										
B. List outside support agencies	*	*	*										*	*	*											*	*	*									
C. List of instruction materials	*	*	*										*	*	*											*	*	*									
D. List of diagnostic tools	*	*	*										*	*	*											*	*	*									
E. Develop Center for use of above materials	*	*	*	*	*	*																															
II. Training of University Personnel																*	*	*	*	*							*	*	*	*							
A. Dissemination of information				*	*	*	*	*	*	*									*	*	*	*	*								*	*	*	*	*	*	
B. Feedback and review								*	*	*	*																										
C. Syllabi component inclusion												*												*												*	
D. Lectures to university personnel by on-campus handicapped individual							*														*										*						
III. Implementation																																					
A. Lectures									*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
B. Observation of techniques									*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
C. Class simulations									*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

*Activities completed

	<u>First Year (1979-80)</u>												<u>Second Year (1980-81)</u>												<u>Third Year (1981-82)</u>												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	
III. Implementation (cont.)																																					
D. Field trips																*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
E. Hands-on experience																*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
F. Development of individual educational program									*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
G. Identify handicapped students									*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*																					
H. Field related feedback and review																			*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
IV. University Personnel To Be Trained																																					
A. Coordinators of Professional Education Course Sequence and the faculty				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*																									
B. Methods course instructors																*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*												
C. Center coordinators (supervisors of clinical experiences)																*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*												
D. Faculty of Adm. Certificate																											*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
V. Development and Dissemination																																					
A. Development																																					
1. Development of booklets addressing																																					
a. Teacher liability				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*																									
b. Least rest. alternative				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*																									

*Activities completed

	First-Year (1979-80)												Second Year (1980-81)												Third Year (1981-82)												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	
V. Development and Dissimination (cont.)																																					
c. Public Law 94-142				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*																									
d. Individual education program				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*																									
e. Due process				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*																									
f. Illinois rules and regulations				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*																									
2. Syllabi for Courses								*	*	*	*	*	*	*																							
B. Dissemination of Books To:																																					
1. University faculty								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
2. University students								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
3. Other university faculty, administrators & students													*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
4. Illinois Office of Education													*	*	*																						
5. ACTE					*			*					*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
6. Etc.																																					
VI. Administration																																					
A. Budgeting	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
B. Personnel	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
C. Coordination																																					
1. Faculty	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
2. Advisory Board	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

* Activities completed

	<u>First Year (1979-80)</u>												<u>Second Year (1980-81)</u>												<u>Third Year (1981-82)</u>												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	
VI. Administration (cont.)																																					
3. Project staff	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
D. Implementation of project	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
E. Evaluation																																					
1. of products										*	*	*	*	*	*							*	*	*	*								*	*	*	*	
2. of university course impact on students										*	*	*	*			*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
3. of student behavior in the field																												*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
4. university faculty receptivity	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

*Activities completed

References

References

1. Beggs, Donald L., Nancy L. Quisenberry, Sidney R. Miller, and William Koenecke. A Resource Guide for Administrative Tasks and P.L. 94-142, Volume I. Carbondale, Illinois: College of Education, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1982.
2. Clark, Elmer J., Nancy L. Quisenberry, Sidney R. Miller and John Sachs. Dean's Grant: Second Year Report and Evaluation, Volume II. Carbondale, Illinois: College of Education, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1981.

Appendix A
Criterion Referenced Tests

Appendix A
Criterion Reference Tests

Test One
Role of the Regular Educator
in the Education of the Handicapped

1. Which of the persons below have been delegated the responsibility for referring a student for a study evaluation?
 - a) Regular classroom teacher
 - b) Parents
 - c) Student (when appropriate)
 - d) Special education teacher
 - e) Any one of the above
2. Which of the following personnel participate in a multidisciplinary team staffing?
 - a) Regular classroom teacher
 - b) Parents
 - c) Special educators
 - d) Student (where appropriate)
 - e) All of the above
3. The role of the multidisciplinary team is to:
 - a) determine an appropriate educational placement of a student.
 - b) assess the handicapped student's level of functioning.
 - c) refer handicapped students for a case study evaluation.
 - d) a and b
 - e) all of the above

4. Which of the following are not the role of a regular classroom teacher in the education of the handicapped student?
- a) Working cooperatively with special education personnel
 - b) Participating in the I.E.P. meeting
 - c) Writing an I.E.P.
 - d) Referring a student for a case study evaluation
 - e) all of the above
5. What are some of the school-related services for the handicapped student?
- a) Social work service
 - b) Counseling service
 - c) Psychological service
 - d) Transportation
 - e) All of the above
6. The following are mandated components of the Individualized Education Program except:
- a) the student's level of performance.
 - b) due process hearing.
 - c) short-term objectives.
 - d) special education and related services.
 - e) annual goals.
7. An Individual Education Program is:
- a) a legally binding document.
 - b) only for handicapped students.
 - c) for all children in our schools.
 - d) b. and c
 - e) all of the above

8. Regular classroom teachers are responsible for participating in the education of the handicapped due to the Congressional legislation of:
- a) the Hatch Act.
 - b) the 1964 Civil Rights Act.
 - c) the Adjournment Resolution of 1975.
 - d) P.L. 94-142.
9. Providing handicapped students the least restrictive education would be best accomplished in:
- a) special education classroom..
 - b) special school.
 - c) regular classroom with supportive services.
 - d) institutions.
10. Circle the person or persons who you feel should be involved in the development of a handicapped student's I.E.P.
- a) Parents
 - b) Regular classroom teacher
 - c) Special educators
 - d) Student
 - e) All of the above
11. Preparing handicapped students for job awareness and job training will be:
- a) a benefit to the handicapped.
 - b) a benefit to the handicapped and the community.
 - c) misuse of tax dollars.
 - d) a waste of time.
12. The problems of the handicapped are:
- a) too difficult for regular educators to mediate in the regular classroom.
 - b) can only be mediated by special educators.
 - c) can be mediated cooperatively by special and regular educators.
 - d) a burden on the schools.

Test Two
Characteristics of Handicapped Students

1. Of the behaviors listed below, which one best describes a student who has a visual perception problem?
 - a) Holding an object too close or too far from his eyes
 - b) Rubbing his eyes frequently
 - c) Inability to discriminate between different symbols
 - d) Inability to communicate with sign language
2. Which of the following characteristics might be exhibited by a student who is having an auditory perception problem?
 - a) Inability to discriminate sounds
 - b) Watching lips of someone communicating with him
 - c) Inability to attend to an auditory stimulus
 - d) Inability to hear a stimulus
3. Which of the following characteristics might be demonstrated by a student who is visually impaired?
 - a) Squinting
 - b) Poor visual memory
 - c) Visual sequencing problems
 - d) Problems with visual figure-ground
4. An example of sensory-motor problem is:
 - a) the inability to develop consistent left or right-sided approach in use of hands or feet
 - b) the inability to use arms and legs effectively
 - c) the inability to utilize extremities effectively
 - d) all of the above
5. Public Law 94-142, "The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975", requires that:
 - a) all handicapped students have equal rights and educational opportunities as regular students
 - b) all handicapped students must be placed in the regular classroom
 - c) all handicapped students receive a free and appropriate education
 - d) b & c
 - e) a & c
6. Which are the major sensory areas that are important to the educational growth of a student?
 - a) Speech
 - b) Vision
 - c) Hearing
 - d) b & c
 - e) All of the above

7. Which of the following is the least restrictive environment for handicapped students?
- a) Special classroom
 - b) Special school
 - c) Regular classroom
 - d) Resource room
8. If a student is experiencing difficulties in academic or social interactions, and is suspected of being educationally handicapped, the classroom teacher is required to:
- a) send a letter to the parents of the student
 - b) inform the principal
 - c) make a referral
 - d) develop a special program for the student
9. Education of the handicapped student would be best accomplished in a:
- a) special school
 - b) institution
 - c) regular classroom
 - d) special classroom
10. Identification of students with learning problems/handicaps should begin with:
- a) the regular classroom teacher
 - b) special educators
 - c) psychologists
 - d) social workers
11. Regular educators:
- a) should be trained to mainstream handicapped students
 - b) are not expected to teach handicapped students
 - c) should learn about handicapped students on a volunteer basis
 - d) need extra training to work with the handicapped.

Test Three
P.L. 94-142 "Origins and Foundations"

1. The passage of Public Law 94-142 assures special education and relate services for:
 - a) severely handicapped
 - b) mildly handicapped
 - c) most handicapped children
 - d) all handicapped regardless of the severity
 - e) none of the above
2. During the middle ages emphasis on the handicapped was directed towards:
 - a) keeping the handicapped locked behind doors
 - b) more humane care
 - c) teaching vocational skills
 - d) both B and C
 - e) none of the above
3. Attempts to educate the mentally retarded began to emerge during:
 - a) the 1900's
 - b) the 1800's
 - c) the 1700's
 - d) the 1600's
4. Pioneers in the field of Special Education were:
 - a) Rousseu and Plato
 - b) Sabatino and Miller
 - c) Montessori and Itard
 - d) Juan Bonet and Hewitt
5. Which of the following laws prohibits and federally assisted programs to discriminate against any persons due to a handicapping condition?
 - a) P.L. 93-380, Title VI-B
 - b) P.L. 93-112, Section 504
 - c) P.L. 94-145
 - d) P.L. 98-888
6. The ultimate purpose of _____ is to avoid wasting time and money of our courts while insuring competent decisions concerning the education of the handicapped:
 - a) Supreme Court
 - b) due process procedure
 - c) rehabilitation
 - d) occupational therapy

7. Equal education is associated with which of the following court cases (Litigation):
- a) Green vs. Board of Education, Wisconsin
 - b) Brown, no Board of Education of Topeka
 - c) Spangler vs. Board of Education of Southern California
 - d) Both A and B
8. Rehabilitation for the mentally retarded in the nineteenth century had its first shaping step in:
- a) institutions
 - b) public schools
 - c) colleges and universities
 - d) the home
9. In your opinion which is the best placement for the handicapped?
- a) public schools. (mainstreaming)
 - b) institutions (24 hour care)
 - c) institutions (8 hour care)
10. In your opinion has P.L. 94-142 been:
- a) just one big headache for educators
 - b) great in getting the handicapped appropriate services
 - c) unnecessary
 - d) another meal ticket for lawyers

Appendix B

Analysis of Professional Education Centers-
Experiences With Handicapped

Appendix B

ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION CENTERS- EXPERIENCES WITH HANDICAPPED

1. Indicate yes or no to each question for each school within your area of responsibilities.

	Yes	No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Are handicapped students mainstreamed in this school?	_____	_____
Number of classrooms in the school	_____	_____
Number of classrooms with mainstreamed handicapped students.	_____	_____
Number of self-contained classrooms for handicapped students.	_____	_____
Special education resource room	_____	_____

2. Does the school building receive ancillary support services? Yes No

If yes, which of the following do the schools receive:

1. ☐ Speech therapist
2. ☐ Psychologist
3. ☐ Nurse
4. ☐ Physical Therapist
5. ☐ Occupational Therapist
6. ☐ Social worker
7. ☐ Guidance Counselors
8. ☐ Adaptive Physical Education Teacher
9. ☐ Occupational Education Coordinator
10. ☐ Reading specialists
11. ☐ Music Therapist
12. ☐ Audiologist
13. ☐ Art Therapist
14. ☐ Itinerant Teacher

Circle the appropriate number:

High

Low

3. To what degree does the school principal actively participate in the I.E.P. meetings? 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
4. To what degree do special education personnel provide assistance to regular classroom teachers that have handicapped students mainstreamed in their classrooms? 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
5. To what degree do regular education personnel participate in I.E.P. meetings for handicapped students? 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>
6. To what degree is the school principal aware of state and federal laws effecting services for the handicapped?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
7. To what degree do regular classroom teachers provide handicapped learners specific specialized instruction?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
8. To what degree is this school building accessible to handicapped students?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
9. To what degree do regular classroom teachers have specialized instructional materials for handicapped learners?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
10. To what degree is the school principal used as an active consultant to special education personnel on a day-to-day basis?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
11. To what degree do regular education personnel help formulate handicapped students program goals and objectives as stated in the I.E.P.?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
12. Circle the number of hours the regular classroom teacher received inservice training concerning P.L. 94-142.	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
13. To what degree is the school principal supporting the basic concept of P.L. 94-142?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
14. To what degree do regular educators provide special aptitude (e.g., perceptual or conceptual training) for handicapped learners in their classroom?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
15. To what degree do the regular classroom teachers consult regularly with special education teachers in carrying out of the handicapped student's program?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
16. To what degree does the school principal appear to support the mandate of P.L. 94-142?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
17. To what degree do regular classroom teachers implement specific instructional goals, objectives and activities for handicapped learners in their classroom?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	
18. To what degree are regular classroom teachers in support of the basic concept of P.L. 94-142?	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	

Center Coordinator:

Name of School:

Grades served:

Preschool ☐

K ☐

1 ☐

2 ☐

3 ☐

4 ☐

5 ☐

6 ☐

7 ☐

8 ☐

9 ☐

10 ☐

11 ☐

12 ☐

Region of Illinois:

Central ☐

Northern ☐

Southern ☐

Urban ☐

Suburban ☐

Rural ☐